



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,290	12/31/2003	Kevin Brown	1875.39/20005	8408
26111 7590 07/22/2008 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
RIYAMI, ABDULLA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2616				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,290

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

ABDULLAH RIYAMI

Art Unit

2616

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/07/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2616

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-8, 11-14, 1617, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 6813651 B1) in view of Shippy et al. (US 2005/0254645).

In claim 1, Smith et al. teaches of a method for transmitting data (see column 2, lines 15-54), comprising:

(a) receiving a first data stream (see column 6, lines 21-30 and figure 5, blocks 102, 202 and 204) from a first physical transmission medium (see 1394 link, column 6, lines 21-24 and figure 5, block 102) using a first communications standard (see 1394 link, column 6, lines 21-24);

(b) appending (see checksum padding, column 6, lines 21-30) to each byte in the first data stream a data type identification (DTID) (see checksum padding unit, column 6, lines 21-30), thereby creating a technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44) having a first bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44);

(c) matching (see column 5, lines 40-44) the first bit rate to a second bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44) that corresponds to a second communications standard (see column 5, lines 31-37); and

(e) transmitting the technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44)

over a second physical transmission medium (see column 5, lines 31-37) using the second communications standard (see column 5, lines 31-37 and figure 5, block 208).

Smith et al. does not expressly disclose appending to each byte a data type identification, wherein the DTID identifies a class of data associated with the byte.

Shippy et al. discloses appending to each byte a data type identification, wherein the DTID identifies a class of data associated with the byte (see figures 6 and 18 and paragraph 54 and 66).

Smith et al. and Shippy et al. are analogous art since they are from the same field of endeavor of data transmission over an IEEE 1394 bus.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Shippy et al.'s teaching of data type identification (see figures 6 and 18 and paragraph 54 and 66) in Smith et al. data stream transmission system (see figure 5). The motivation to combine would have been to have a method and device wherein encryption techniques are used to safeguard the transfer of data streams between devices leading to greater protection of data.

In claims 3 and 4, Smith et al. teaches these limitations, see response to arguments.

In claim 5, Smith et al. teaches of a method for transmitting data (see column 2, lines 15-54), wherein step (e) comprises transmitting the technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44) over the transmission medium (see column

5, lines 31-37 and figure 5, block 208) using IEEE 802.3 1000BASE-T standards (see column 5, lines 31-37 and figure 5, block 208).

In claim 6, Smith et al. teaches of a method for transmitting data (see column 2, lines 15-54), wherein step (e) comprises transmitting category five unshielded twisted pair (UTP) wiring (see column 2, line 28).

In claim 7, Smith et al. teaches of a method for transmitting data (see column 2, lines 15-54), further comprising:

(f) receiving (see column 6, lines 27-30) the technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44) at the second bit rate (see column 6 lines 27-30);

(g) matching (see column 5, lines 40-44 and column 6, lines 21-24) the second bit rate to the first bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44 and column 6, lines 21-24 and figure 5, block 212);

(h) restoring (see column 6, lines 27-30) the first data stream by removing the DTID (see checksum stripping unit, column 6, lines 27-30 and figure 5, block 212) from each byte of the technology independent data stream (see checksum stripping unit, column 6, lines 27-30 and figure 5, block 212); and

(i) receiving (see column 6, lines 27-30) the first data stream into a third transmission medium (see figure 5, transmission between blocks 212 and 202) using the first communications standard (see figure 5, transmission between blocks 212 and 202).

In claim 8, Smith et al. teaches of a communications reconciliation sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), comprising:

a transmit data type identification (DTID) circuit (see checksum padding, column 6, lines 21-30 and figure 5, block 204) coupled to an output (see figure 5, block 202) of a first transmission medium (see 1394 link, column 6, lines 21-24 and figure 5, block 102) for appending a DTID to each byte in an original data stream thereby generating a technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44) at first bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44) that represents an original data stream (see figure 5, from block 202 to 204) from the first transmission medium (see 1394 link, column 6, lines 21-24);

a transmit first-in-first-out (FIFO) buffer (see column 6, lines 31-40) coupled to an output of the transmit DTID (see figure 5, blocks 204, 206, 210, and 212) and an input of a second transmission medium (see figure 5, blocks 204, 206, 210, and 212), the transmit FIFO buffer for matching (see column 6, lines 31-40) the first bit rate to a second bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44 and column 6, lines 21-24) used by the second transmission medium (see column 5, lines 31-37 and figure 5, block 208);

a receive FIFO buffer (see column 6, lines 34-40) coupled to an output (see column 6, lines 34-40) of the second transmission medium, the receive FIFO buffer (see column 6, lines 34-40) for matching (see column 6, lines 34-40) the second bit rate to the first bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44 and column 6, lines 34-40); and a receive DTID circuit (see figure 5, block 212) coupled to an output of the receive FIFO buffer (see column 6, lines 34-40) for restoring (see checksum stripping unit,

column 6, lines 27-30 and figure 5, block 212) the original data stream from the technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44).

Smith et al. does not expressly disclose a data identification circuit appending to each byte a data type identification, wherein the DTID identifies a class of data associated with the byte.

Shippy et al. discloses a data identification circuit appending to each byte a data type identification, wherein the DTID identifies a class of data associated with the byte (see figures 6 and 18 and paragraph 54 and 66).

Smith et al. and Shippy et al. are analogous art since they are from the same field of endeavor of data transmission over an IEEE 1394 bus.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Shippy et al.'s teaching of data type identification (see figures 6 and 18 and paragraph 54 and 66) in Smith et al. data stream transmission system (see figure 5). The motivation to combine would have been to have a method and device wherein encryption techniques are used to safeguard the transfer of data streams between devices leading to greater protection of data.

In claim 11, Smith et al. teaches of a communications reconciliation sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), wherein the first transmission medium (see 1394 link, column 6, lines 21-24 and figure 5, block 102) is an IEEE 1394b data bus (see column 3, line 51 and line 55).

In claim 12, Smith et al. teaches of a communications reconciliation sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), wherein the original data stream (see column 6, lines 21-

30) comprises unencoded, unscrambled 1394b data (see column 6, lines 21-30) from a physical sub-layer of the IEEE 1394b data bus (see column 3, line 51 and line 55).

In claim 13, Smith et al. teaches of a communications reconciliation sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), wherein the unencoded, unscrambled 1394b data (see column 6, lines 21-30) is tapped from a beta mode function circuit (see checksum padding, column 6, lines 21-30 and figure 5, block 204) of the IEEE 1394b data bus (see column 3, line 51 and line 55).

In claim 14, Smith et al. teaches of a communications reconciliation sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), wherein the second transmission medium (see column 5, lines 31-37) is an IEEE 802.3 1000BASE-T data bus (see column 5, lines 31-37).

In claim 16, Smith et al. teaches of a communications sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102) for transmitting data formatted according to a first communications standard (see column 6, lines 21-30 and figure 5, blocks 102, 202 and 204) over a physical medium (see column 5, lines 31-37 and figure 5, block 208) designed for data formatted according to a second communications standard (see column 5, lines 31-37 and figure 5, block 208), comprising:

means for receiving a first data stream (see column 6, lines 21-30 and figure 5, blocks 102, 202 and 204) formatted according to the first communication standard (see column 6, lines 21-30 and figure 5, blocks 102, 202 and 204);

means for appending a DTID to each byte in an original data stream thereby creating (see column 5, lines 40-44) a technology independent data stream (see

column 5, lines 40-44) from the first data stream (see column 6, lines 21-26), the technology independent data stream having a first bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44);
means for matching the first bit rate to a second bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44) corresponding to the second communications standard (see column 5, lines 31-37);
and means for transmitting the technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44) over the physical medium (see column 5, lines 31-37) according to the second communications standard (see column 5, lines 31-37).

Smith et al. does not expressly disclose a means for appending to each byte a data type identification, wherein the DTID identifies a class of data associated with the byte.

Shippy et al. discloses a data identification circuit appending to each byte a data type identification, wherein the DTID identifies a class of data associated with the byte (see figures 6 and 18 and paragraph 54 and 66).

Smith et al. and Shippy et al. are analogous art since they are from the same field of endeavor of data transmission over an IEEE 1394 bus.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Shippy et al.'s teaching of data type identification (see figures 6 and 18 and paragraph 54 and 66) in Smith et al. data stream transmission system (see figure 5). The motivation to combine would have been to have a method and device wherein encryption techniques are used to safeguard the transfer of data streams between devices leading to greater protection of data.

In claim 17, Smith et al. teaches of a communications sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102) further comprising means for receiving (see column 6, lines 27-30 and figure 5, block 208) the technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44); means for matching the second bit to the first bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44 and column 6, lines 21-24 and figure 5, block 212); means for restoring the first data stream (see checksum stripping unit, column 6, lines 27-30 and figure 5, block 212) from the technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44).

In claim 19, Smith et al. teaches of a communications sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), wherein the restoring (see checksum stripping unit, column 6, lines 27-30 and figure 5, block 212) means comprises removing (see checksum stripping unit, column 6, lines 27-30 and figure 5, block 212) the data type identification from each byte of the technology data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44).

In claim 20, Smith et al. teaches of a communications sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), wherein the matching (see column 6, lines 31-40) means uses a first-in-first-out buffer (see column 6, lines 31-40).

6. Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 6813651 B1) in view of Shippy et al. (US 2005/0254645) further in view of Cheung (US 2004/0039866).

In claim 2 Smith et al. teaches of a method for transmitting data (see column 2, lines 15-54), wherein step (c) comprises:

(i) receiving at a first first-in-first-out (FIFO) buffer (see column 6, lines 31-40) the technology independent data stream (see column 5, lines 40-44) at the first bit rate (see column 5, lines 40-44);

Smith et al. does not expressly disclose steps (ii) when the first FIFO buffer is full, transmitting the technology independent data stream at the second bit rate according to step (e); and (iii) when the FIFO buffer is empty, stopping the transmitting, thereby allowing the FIFO buffer to refill with the technology independent data stream.

Cheung et al. discloses a FIFO buffer (see figure 3, block 308 and figure 5, blocks 504 and 508) that can be configured to transmit when full (see paragraph 49, lines 1-10) and receive/refill when empty (see paragraph 49, lines 1-10).

Smith et al. and Cheung are analogous art because they are from the same fields of endeavor of using a buffer to facilitate the throughput of data between components.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Cheung 's FIFO buffer that transmits/receives when full or empty in Smith's et al. interface device.

The motivation to combine would have been to facilitate and match the throughput of transmission data rates between devices and other components.

In claim 10, Smith et al. teaches of a communications reconciliation sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), comprising:
a transmit FIFO buffer for matching (see column 6, lines 31-40), but does not expressly

disclose that the transmit FIFO buffer is coupled to a pointer for indicating a status of the transmit FIFO buffer.

Cheung et al. discloses a FIFO buffer (see paragraph 49, lines 1-10, figure 3, block 308 and figure 5, blocks 504 and 508) that is coupled to a pointer (see paragraph 45, line 5-10) for indicating a status (see paragraph 45, line 5-10) of the transmit FIFO buffer.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Cheung 's FIFO buffer that transmits/receives when full or empty in Smith's et al. interface device.

The motivation to combine would have been to facilitate and match the throughput of transmission data rates between devices and other components.

Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 6813651 B1) in view of Shippy et al. (US 2005/0254645).

In claim 9, Smith et al. teaches of a communications reconciliation sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), comprising:

a transmit FIFO buffer for matching (see column 6, lines 31-40), but does not expressly disclose that the transmit FIFO buffer is 120 bits deep.

Having a FIFO buffer that is 120 bits deep is well known in the art.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a 120 bits deep, FIFO buffer that transmits/receives in Smith's et al. interface device.

The motivation to combine would have been to facilitate and match the throughput of transmission data rates between devices and other components.

In claim 15, Smith et al. teaches of a communications reconciliation sub-layer (see figure 5, block 102), but does not expressly disclose that the first transmission medium is a universal serial bus.

Official notice is taken that the first transmission medium could be a universal serial bus is well known in the art.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a universal serial bus in Smith's et al. interface device.

The motivation to combine would have been to facilitate and match the throughput of transmission data rates between devices and other components.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See for 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABDULLAH RIYAMI whose telephone number is (571) 270-3119. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy D. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Abdullah Riyami/

Examiner, Art Unit 2616

/Huy D. Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616